

**Appl. No.** : **10/792,144**  
**Filed** : **March 3, 2004**

**REMARKS**

In response to the restriction requirement set forth in the communication, Applicant elects species (b) depicted in Fig. 7. Claims 1-8 are readable on this species. This election is made with traverse for the reason below.

The Office action states that species (a) and (b) depicted in Fig. 4 and 7, respectively, are mutually exclusive processes. It is understood that Fig. 4 relates to injection molding whereas Fig. 7 relates to blow molding, and no process performs both simultaneously. However, one of the features recited in the claims resides in the "cutout" area or portion which corresponds to an exterior boundary between the sections formed by the injection molding and the blow molding. The significance of this boundary cannot be defined by only one of the injection molding or the blow molding. Thus the claimed invention requires both the injection molding and the blow molding, and accordingly, species (a) and (b) are not mutually exclusive in the claimed processes.

Should the Examiner have any questions concerning the response to Election of Species Requirement, the Examiner is respectfully invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number appearing below.


No fees are believed due for the present Amendment, however, should any fees be due, please charge them to our deposit account No. 11-1410.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: June 29, 2007

By: \_\_\_\_\_



Katsuhiro Arai  
Registration No. 43,315  
Attorney of Record  
Customer No. 20,995  
(949) 760-0404

3945065  
062807